

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 5-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Eloranta in view of Nieminen, further in view of Lu. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the previously filed response, and for the following reasons.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner contends that “whether Nieminen will cause all selected users to be treated ‘collective’, as stated by the applicant’s, still reads on the independent claims because Nieminen discloses ‘an identification detail relating a plurality of subscriber’ (collectively). As a result, the argued features are written such that they read upon the cited references. See page 2 of the Advisory Action. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nieminen discloses a communication system for providing services to communication terminals, which correspond to subscribers. Such a service may be, for instance, the provision of a weather forecast or the transmission of emails to a mobile station of a user. A service data storage unit is used for storing a set of service provision definitions. Each service provision definition comprises a service field storing an indication of a service and an address field storing an expression specifying the address of one or more of the terminals. Wildcards may be used in order to specify more than one subscriber number (see page 6, second paragraph). A service logic unit is arranged to receive communications in the system and compares an address specified in a communication with the expressions stored in the address field of each of the service provision definitions. On the basis of that comparison the service provision unit provides the desired service to the terminal respectively to the plurality of terminals identified by the address.

When monitoring a data communication of a suspicious user automatically, both the information received and transmitted by/to the user is monitored. By contrast thereto, when selectively providing services to authorized users it is only necessary to allow information flowing from a service provider towards the user. Even if an information flow is originating from the user, Nieminen fails to disclose establishing a two-sided communication, wherein information flows both in the direction towards and in the direction away from the selected user. Since there is no disclosure in Nieminen that wildcards can also be used for a two-sided communication, a person skilled in the art would not use wildcards for deciding whether a two-sided communication has to be intercepted.

Additionally, when providing data access to at least one user by employing a wildcard automatically, all users fulfilling the corresponding criterion will be provided with the same service. By contrast thereto, when monitoring a plurality of users having an identification detail, which corresponds to a certain identification detail abbreviation, all users together with their counterparts will be monitored separately. Therefore, using a wildcard according to Nieminen will cause all selected users to be treated collectively in the same way as all other selected users. By contrast, using an abbreviation according to the claimed invention will cause all selected users to be treated individually by monitoring all information flowing to and from each of the selected users separately. Therefore, Nieminen teaches a person skilled in the art that using a wildcard will only allow for a collective treatment of selected users.

Claims 3-4 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Eloranta in view of Nieminen, further in view of Lu and Helferich. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the arguments above, and since neither Lu nor Helferich disclose the deficiencies.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing. The Examiner is requested to refer to Attorney Docket No. 118744-042 when responding to this correspondence.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Kevin R. Spivak

Reg. No. 43,148

Customer No. 29177

Dated: February 15, 2008